

obsolete and dilapidated classrooms and facilities. We will hold states and schools accountable for results, so that all children have the opportunity to meet high standards. We will expand opportunities for college and later learning by making college tuition tax deductible and by increasing Pell grants. We will reach out to millions of disadvantaged young children and help them to see and believe that college can be a realistic option for their future. We will help the nation's workers obtain the on-going skills training they need, and provide tax credits for employers who offer worker training.

In all of these ways, AL GORE's approach to education is the right direction for the nation's future. We have reached the final days of this Congress, and we have yet to give needed priority to education. Negotiations are underway, and there is still a chance to meet our commitment to families and communities across the country, and do what is needed to meet their education needs.

At the end of this Congress, families across the country will assess what we have done to meet these priorities, and the verdict has to be, "too little, too later." This Republican Congress deserves a failing grade on education, and no "election eve conversion" is enough to avoid that failing grade. The American people share our Democratic commitment to the nation's students, parents, schools and communities. We have already made students and families across the country wait too long for this needed education assistance.

We have seen the SAT math scores at their highest in 30 years. This is a very modest improvement nationwide, but all the indicators are going in the right direction as compared to Texas, and scores have increased both for males and females.

The number of students taking advanced math and science classes from 1990 to 2000: There is an increase in the number of students taking precalculus, calculus, and physics; students are taking more difficult and challenging courses. They are doing better on the national standardized tests. That is because they want to go to college because there is an increasing opportunity available to them under the proposals made by the administration. That is catching on with students all over the country because we are finding more and more students are taking the SAT. More and more students are taking the difficult, challenging, rigorous tests. Students are doing better in spite of the fact more are taking more difficult and challenging courses, and the national trends are moving in the right direction. That is completely contrary to what has happened in the State of Texas.

This is not to suggest we don't have many areas of our country and many school districts that don't need a great

deal of help and assistance. However, what we are seeing as a result of the administration, which Vice President Gore has been a part of, and he has been strongly supportive of, these education programs are moving in the right direction. They are moving in the right direction.

When he talks about smaller class sizes, better trained teachers, mentoring in terms of teaching, afterschool programs, new technology, and accountability, it is being based upon the schools and school districts which are effectively breaking the mold where we are getting children with enhanced achievement and accomplishment. That is what I think families want in this country, not just cliches.

I also wish to mention a final point of contrast between Governor Bush and the Vice President on the early education initiatives and how important they are. Study after study has shown that children who have quality learning experiences early in life have a greater ability to learn in school, to work successfully with their teachers, their peers, and master needed skills. We can do much more to put this impressive research into practice.

We have some bold initiatives which are bipartisan. I commend the leadership, Senator STEVENS, Senator JEFFORDS, and others who have been a part of this effort for some period of time. I think we have some real movement here. That debate has been independent of the broader issues on elementary and secondary education. I know in the Vice President's proposal, in terms of investing in the future, this early education program has an important commitment.

I remind our colleagues that this whole area was an area that had bipartisan support a number of years ago when the Governors met in Charlottesville. The first recommendation was made to the American people that the Governors were going to be committed. We were challenging the administration. The Congress was ready to learn. Children ought to be ready to learn when they go to school. "Ready to learn" means giving those children the kind of confidence building that is so essential in the very early years, when their brains are in formation.

Various Carnegie commission reports have demonstrated the early interventions help build confidence. They also demonstrate children begin to appreciate learning in these early formative years. Second, the children develop interpersonal skills which are enormously important when they begin their education experience. Finally, the tests show they develop a sense of humor, which I think is probably of value in carrying one through life.

This early intervention has been particularly and repeatedly emphasized and stressed by the Vice President. It ought to be taken into strong consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business.

Mr. ALLARD. I ask unanimous consent I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes under morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE DEFICIT

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I have been following the debate between the two Presidential candidates and notice that the Vice President wants to take full credit for paying down the deficit. At the time that the legislation went through the Congress, the President's proposal was a tax increase, and it was a proposal to increase spending in 1993.

I served on the Budget Committee in the House and I expressed at that time in reality this was not a tax to cut the deficit; it was a tax to increase spending. As members of the House Budget Committee, we had pointed out at that time that it was going to create a \$2 billion deficit as far as the mind's eye could see.

So now we have the Vice President on the campaign trail taking credit for having eliminated the deficit. In reality, what it was, it was the Republican Congress. In 1993, when this was passed, Democrats controlled the Senate, Democrats controlled the House, and Democrats were in control of the Presidency. This passed by a very narrow margin in the House. Not one Republican voted for it. It came over to the Senate and would not have passed the Senate if at that time the Vice President, AL GORE, had not voted for the budget proposal which, in effect, was going to maintain the deficit at \$200 billion.

So I wanted to bring some facts to the floor in that regard. I thought it was important I do that.

This year, in July, just before we were ready to adjourn, the assistant minority leader pointed out that I made a comment at one time and my comment was, about the President's plan in 1992, which we were voting on:

In summary, the plan has a fatal flaw—it does not reduce the deficit.

Today I am standing up on the Senate floor to stand by my remarks because, if we look historically, that plan did not reduce the deficit. In fact, I repeat, AL GORE's record is that of a tax hike because he is the one who voted for this—his vote alone. AL GORE would like to have you believe that actually what he was doing was putting in place a plan to eliminate the deficit.

I point out there is no document in the Clinton-Gore administration that exists that shows the largest tax hike—and that is what this was—the largest

tax hike in American history did, or would have, or could ever have balanced the budget—not one document.

I have here before me "A Vision of Change For America." This is dated February 17, 1993. This is the President's plan on how he was going to eliminate the deficit. If we look at that, on page 22 of that document, we see the projected deficit 5 years out, from 1993, is \$241 billion, despite all the rhetoric and how it is going to pay down the deficit with the tax increase.

Then, in September of the same year, in 1993, if we look on page 34 of the "Mid-Session Review" of the 1994 budget, we see the projected deficit out to 1998 is \$181 billion.

Then, if we look at the budget of the U.S. Government proposed for 1995, proposed in 1994, again, on page 13 of that particular document we see the projected deficit, 5 years out from the date of that document, is \$181 billion again. It is flat-lining out at approximately \$200 billion a year.

Then we have another document that was published in 1994, the "Mid-Session Review" of the 1995 budget. On page 3 of that document, it shows that the deficit, 5 years out from that date, is projected to be \$207 billion. This is deficit spending. This is where you are going in, on any one fiscal year, and you are spending more than what you bring in, in revenues.

Then, following out through the first couple of years since his proposal, we look at the document, "The Budget Of The U.S. Government, Fiscal Year 1996." If we look on page 2 of that particular document, we see the projected deficit for the year 2000, 5 years out, was \$194 billion.

Then, in the Mid-Session Review on that particular budget, Mid-Session Review of the 1996 budget, we see the projected deficit 5 years out on that document is \$235 billion in 2005.

If you recall, in 1996 we had the Republican Congress elected. Under pressure from the Republicans in the Congress, the President finally admitted that his plan was not going to eliminate the deficit. So, in working with the Republican Congress, a new plan was beginning to be put in place. That is what this chart reflects. It reflects two things. The red part is this projected deficit that was passed by the President and the Congress and put into law. As we can see, it is about \$200 billion deficit spending. This is a tax increase, the largest tax increase in the history of this country.

Then we see the Republicans come into power in 1996, and what happens, which is reflected by this black line, is that the deficits dramatically are reduced, and then we find, a little past 1997, actually we are beginning to get some surpluses until where we are at 2000, where we have the huge surpluses we are dealing with today.

I think the wrong person is taking credit for this. It is the Republican

Congress that made a difference on deficit spending. It was not the largest tax increase in the history of this country which was passed in the Senate, here, by the Vice President. So this is a summary of what happened 2 years after the largest tax hike in history. Finally, Clinton and GORE admitted America was still 10 years away and almost \$1 trillion short of a balanced budget.

It is not just their documents I demonstrated with on the floor of the Senate. In their own words, they verify this. During the signing ceremony on the largest tax hike in history, not a word was uttered by President Clinton about balancing the budget or saving Social Security or paying off the national debt. At that time, the Republican plan was we really needed to have dramatic changes if we were going to make a difference in saving Social Security, eliminating the deficit, and paying down the debt. But all the plan we got out of AL GORE and the administration was that we increased taxes and we would eliminate the deficit, and it was not working because they also increased spending.

If we look at the President's comments at the signing of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, on August 10 of 1993—this is from a book entitled "Public Papers of the President, William J. Clinton," 1993, volume 2, page 1355. If you read through his comments and examine his remarks, not once was a word uttered about balancing the budget, saving Social Security, or even paying off the national debt. Thus, AL GORE's tax hike was actually no act of heroism. What it really was, was a tax-and-spend vote instead of a tax to end the deficit.

So I wanted to address that issue here on the floor of the Senate.

In summation, Mr. President, no Clinton-Gore budget document from February 13, 1993, through July 28, 1995, ever shows a balanced budget resulting from Mr. GORE's record tax hike. No Clinton-Gore budget document from February 13, 1993, through July 28, 1995, ever shows a Social Security surplus being saved from Mr. GORE's record tax hike. And no Clinton-Gore budget document from February 13, 1993, through July 28, 1995, ever shows debt reduction or elimination resulting from Mr. GORE's record tax hike. Yet AL GORE now claims and lectures as if he actually created this surplus.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

ADOPTION TAX CREDIT FOR SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I was on the floor yesterday and said that I would be back every day speaking about this issue, I think one of the more important issues that we need to address before we leave town. Nobody

is too sure when that is actually going to happen. Some of us were expecting to be back home, having finished the people's work, weeks ago. Even as I inquire on both sides of the aisle, there is not any sense of when we will get home. I will stay here as long as it takes to get the job done, and I am not complaining.

One of the things I hope we can get done in some way, somehow, through some rule, some procedure, or some bill before we leave is to fix something so we will not be embarrassed about what we have not done. I will explain.

A few years ago, 5 years to be exact, a wonderful new provision was put in the law called the adoption tax credit. I am the cochair, along with Senator CRAIG, my wonderful colleague from Idaho. This is a wonderful coalition of Democrats, Republicans, conservatives, liberals, but we have all come together on the issue of adoption, promoting it as a wonderful way to build families, to strengthen communities, to give children hope, to put parents together with children whom they have always wanted to have, dreamed, and worked for, who will love them and raise them because governments do not do a very good job of that. The fact is, there are literally millions and millions of children in this world who are desperate for someone to love them and provide a home.

Congress, in a bipartisan expression, overwhelmingly put into effect a wonderful tax credit because adoptions, unlike pregnancy, are not covered by insurance. There are not the same benefits, unfortunately, in the labor market or in business for pregnancies and adoption.

Recognizing the somewhat disadvantage on families who build their families through adoption, the Congress rightfully put in place a \$5,000 credit for families.

There is a recent Treasury report that says the credit is being used by thousands of families. This report, which was filed in the last 2 weeks, goes into some very clear and interesting detail about who is using this credit, how much the expenses related to adoption are.

For those who are not familiar, since our children are adopted, I can say from personal experience that there are expenses associated not only with the legal act itself but with agency expenses. In the United States, that can range anywhere from a low of \$2,000 to a high of \$15,000 or \$20,000. For international adoptions—and there are many Members and staffers who have adopted who can give personal testimony—that can range anywhere from a low of \$5,000 to \$30,000. It is an expense with which many moderate- and middle-income families have difficulty.

Despite those difficulties, there are families all over this Nation who have adopted not one not two children. I